

**Serial Number 10/669,531**

**AMENDMENTS TO DRAWINGS**

Please amend Fig. 2 to include reference numeral 3 indicating the data bus, as indicated in the attached REPLACEMENT SHEET.

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Amendments to Claims, Specification, and Drawings

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of original claim 7.

Fig. 2 has been amended to include reference numeral 3, which was mentioned in line 2 on page 5 of the original specification, but inadvertently omitted from the drawings. Reference numeral 3 indicates a data bus.

Finally, the specification, abstract, and claims have been amended to correct various grammatical and idiomatic errors, including incorrect spelling of “cellular” in claim 3 as noted in item 2 on page 2 of the Official Action.

Because all of the changes are formal in nature, it is respectfully submitted that they do not involve new matter.

2. Formalities

The claims, specification, and abstract have been revised to place the application in proper U.S. format. Because the changes are all formal in nature, it is respectfully submitted that the changes do not involve new matter.

3. Rejection of Claims 1-5 and 7 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0043697 (Cox) and U.S. Patent No. 6,980,631 (Danzl)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Cox publication and Danzl patent fail to disclose or suggest the feature wherein:

- a “front-end customer” calls with a question or complaint;
- a voice file is recorded and an associated index generated;

## Serial Number 10/669,531

- the host associates the call with a back-end customer (such as a company receiving the complaint)
- the back-end customer is notified of the front-end customer's call and provided with the associated index;
- when the back-end customer wishes to listen to the voice file, the back-end customer calls the host and provides a password and the associated index, enabling the back-end customer to securely and quickly play back the voice file.

Neither the Cox publication nor the Danzl patent discloses or suggests providing a voice file index to a back-end customer, as claimed, so that the back-end customer can later call the host, provide the index, and listen to the voice file. While Cox teaches accessing voice files through a web browser, which eliminates the need to send an index to the back-end customer (who can instead type in search criteria), Cox does not provide for telephone calls from the back-end customer (at least that provide rapid access to voice files through the use of the index previously provided to the back-end customer). Danzl, on the other hand, does not provide for any sort of voice file access by the back-end customer.

According to the Examiner, paragraphs 0015-0017, 0042, 0045, and 0072 of the Cox publication disclose "allowing the back-end customer to access the message with the associated index." The Applicant respectfully disagrees. Cox discloses allowing the back-end customer to access a voice file based on the identity of a call center assistant, the contents of the recording's file name, or the contents of an associated database entry, but not an "associated index" that has been provided to the back-end customer in a notification message upon receipt of the front-end customer's call and looking-up the back-end customer's address in a database. In fact, there is no need for such an index because, in the system of Cox, the "reviewer" selects the file to be played back through a web browser. Cox does not provide the back-end customer with an index as part of a notification message, and does not permit the back-end user to simply call in the index in order to play it back.

Claim 1 specifically recites that “*the host sends a **reply message** associated with the **associated index** to the replay address of the corresponding back-end customer*” and that the voice file is retrieved when the host receives a “***call from said one of the back-end customers including an input password and index associated with the voice file.***” The claimed invention eliminates the need for the back-end customer to access voice files through the web, by inputting search criteria such as message content or the like as disclosed by Cox. Instead, the back-end customer can simply make a **telephone call** to the host, give the index (and a password), and listen to the message from the front-end customer. This allows the back-end customer to access front-end customer messages from, for example, a cellular telephone. The ***web-based playback*** of Cox has no such capability.

This deficiency is not made up for by the Danzl patent, which teaches a system and method for reporting calls to a back-end customer, but does not include any sort of voice file index in the reports, much less the capability of accessing voice files by **calling** the host and providing an index and password.

Because the Cox publication teaches ***web access*** to voice files and not ***telephone-call access*** facilitated by an ***index provided to the back-end customer*** upon looking up the back-end customer’s address in a back-end customer database after recording of the voice file, and because the Danzl patent does not teach any sort of voice file access, it is respectfully submitted that the Cox publication and Danzl patent would not have suggested the claimed invention to one of ordinary skill in the art, and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-5 and 7 under 35 USC §103(a) is respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of Claim 6 Under 35 USC §103(a) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0043697 (Cox) and U.S. Patent Nos. 6,980,631 (Danzl) and 7,027,570 (Pines)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Pines patent, like the Cox publication and Danzl patent, fails to disclose or suggest the feature of allowing the back-end customer to access a voice file by calling in an index provided to the back-end customer by

Serial Number 10/669,531

accessing a back-end customer database and retrieving an address at the time the voice file is recorded. Instead, the Pines patent concerns a method and apparatus for enabling a requester to acquire the telephone number of a wireless callers by inputting "dial strings" containing information about the caller. Pines does not concern accessing voice files, and there is no suggestion that the dial strings include an "associated index" transmitted to the requester is a notification message following recording of a voice file. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that the Pines patent does not make up for the deficiencies of the Cox publication and Danzl patent, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 under 35 USC §103(a) is accordingly requested.

It is respectfully noted that the Pines patent is mis-identified in item 6 on page 2 of the Official Action as U.S. Patent No. 7,027,572, but correctly identified in the PTO-892 form. It is believed that the reference intended to be applied is in fact "Pines" 7,027,570 rather than U.S. Patent No. 7,027,572 (which also concerns a call center, but is directed to storing of caller phone numbers captured by automatic number identification).

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejections and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA  
Registration No. 33,805

Date: August 11, 2006

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB/S:\Producer\brl\Pending A...JHC\CHEN 669531\A01.wpd